

REMARKS

In the subject office action, claims 1-11 were allowed, and claims 12-19 were rejected. Applicants thank the Examiner for allowing claims 1-11, and respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of claims 12-19 below. No amendment has been entered. Thus, original claims 1-19 remain pending.

Rejections under sec 102(e)

Claims 12-13 and 19 were rejected as being fully anticipated by Reshefsky (US 2003/0022703). In particular, the Examiner reasoned that either element 20 or 22 (fig. 1) of Reshefsky anticipated the required "connector" element. First of all, it is amply clear from Fig.1 that element 20 or 22 is a cable, not a connector, as the term "connector" is understood by those of ordinary skill in the art, and used in Applicants' specification. Reshefsky himself clearly refers element 20 or 22 as a "connector cable". See for example paragraph 23.

Secondly, even if we are to ignore that, claim 12 clearly requires that the connector includes two plugs. Again, it is amply clear from Fig. 1 and the corresponding description in paragraph 23, that at the end of connector cable 20 or 22, there is only one plug 28 or 30.

Thirdly, the two required plugs are to be adapted to interface with two corresponding complementary interfaces of the wireless mobile phone. Again, it is amply clear from Fig. 1, and the corresponding description in paragraph 23, that only plug 28 is designed to facilitate attachment of the headset to a wireless mobile phone. However, plug 28 is designed to mate with a single receptacle 41, and not two interfaces as required.

Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, claim 12 is patentable over Reshefsky.

Claims 13 and 19 depend on claim 12, incorporating its limitations. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 13 and 19 are patentable over Reshefsky.

Rejections under sec 103

Claims 14 and 16 were rejected in view of Reshefsky and Adams combined.

As discussed earlier, claim 12 is patentable over Reshefsky. Adam does not remedy the above discussed deficiency of Reshefsky. Thus, claim 12 is patentable over Reshefsky and Adam combined.

Claims 14 and 16 depend on claim 12, incorporating its limitations. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 14 and 16 are patentable over Reshefsky and Adam combined.

Claims 15 and 17-18 were rejected in view of Reshefsky and Choi combined.

As discussed earlier, claim 12 is patentable over Reshefsky. Adam does not remedy the above discussed deficiency of Reshefsky. Thus, claim 12 is patentable over Reshefsky and Adam combined.

Claims 15 and 17-18 depend on claim 12, incorporating its limitations. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 15 and 17-18 are patentable over Reshefsky and Adam combined.


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, claims 1-19 are all in condition of allowance. Early issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.

Dated: December 15, 2004

By: 
Aloysius AuYeung
Reg# 35,432